

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,289	11/19/2003	Retnamoni R. Braduke	60046.0060US01	2777
53377 7590 01/30/2007 HOPE BALDAUFF HARTMAN, LLC			EXAMINER	
1720 PEACHTREE STREET, N.W SUITE 1010 ATLANTA, GA 30309			TRAN, PHILIP B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•		•	2155	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/30/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

· ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/717,289	BRADUKE, RETNAMONI R.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
•	Philip B. Tran	2155			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app					
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timulated and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 No.	ovember 2006.				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	action is non-final.	•			
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers		•			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11).	epted or b) objected to by the Idrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

Art Unit: 2155 Paper Dated 20070118

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

There are two (2) claims 20. Therefore, the second claim 20 should have been claim 21 and so on. Misnumbered claims 20-23 have been renumbered as claims 21-24.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swank, U.S. Pat. No. 4,641,274 in view of Schauser, U.S. Pat. No. 6,331,855.

Regarding claim 1, Swank teaches a method of redirecting video text data in a computer network, the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2155 Paper Dated 20070118

during a predetermined time interval, checking a video text data memory for changed video text data on a first computer in the computer network (= checking of modified text at a text processor) [see Abstract]; and

sending only the changed video text data from the first computer to a second computer in the computer network (= transmitting back to the remote source only those lines of text which have been modified) [see Abstract and Col. 2, Lines 1-14].

Swank does not explicitly teach checking for modified text during a predetermined time interval. However, Schauser, in the same field of identifying and controlling of updated data on the screen, discloses examining changed data at a predetermined interval [see Schauser, Abstract]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Schauser into the system of Swank in order to quickly identify the data which have been modified or updated on a reasonably periodic basis.

Regarding claim 2, Swank further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein checking a video text data storage for changed video text data comprises: (a) during the predetermined time interval, selecting a line of video text data from among a plurality of lines of video text data stored in the video text data storage as a current line of video text data; (b) calculating a checksum for the current line of video text data; (c) comparing the calculated checksum to a previously saved checksum for the current line of video text data; (d) if the calculated checksum is different than the previously saved checksum for the current line of video text data, then determining that the current line of

video text data in the video text data memory has changed; (e) selecting the next line of video text data in the video text data memory as the current line of video data; and (f) repeating the operations (b)-(e) for each of the plurality of lines of video text data stored in the video text data memory [see Fig. 9 and Col. 1, Line 63 to Col. 2, Line 51 and 28, Line 15 to Col. 29, Line 10].

Regarding claim 3, Swank further teaches the method of claim 2, wherein calculating a checksum for the current line of video text data comprises calculating a unique value from at least one of an attribute of text in the line of video text data and a line position of the text in the line of video text data [see Col. 3, Lines 19-56 and Col. 10, Lines 21-31 and Col. 14, Lines 1-30].

Regarding claim 4, Swank further teaches the method of claim 2 further comprising saving the calculated checksum in a memory location after determining that the current line of video text data in the video text data memory has changed, and storing the current line of video text data in a shared memory in response to determining that the current line of video text data in the video text data memory has changed [see Figs. 1-2 & 7 & 9 and Col. 3, Lines 19-56].

Regarding claim 5, Swank further teaches the method of claim 4 further comprising determining whether the shared memory is full prior to storing the current line of changed video text data in the memory [see Col. 14, Lines 46-68].

Art Unit: 2155 Paper Dated 20070118

Regarding claim 6, Swank further teaches the method of claim 4, wherein sending only the changed video text data from the first computer to a second computer in the computer network comprises sending each changed line of video text data stored in the shared memory during the predetermined time interval from the first computer to the second computer in the computer network [see Abstract and Col. 2, Lines 1-14].

Regarding claim 7, Swank further teaches the method of claim 6, wherein sending each changed line of video text data stored in the shared memory during the predetermined time interval from the first computer to the second computer in the computer network comprises sending each changed line of video text data stored in the shared memory from the first computer to the second computer in the computer network in response to determining that the memory is full [see Abstract and Col. 2, Lines 1-14 and Col. 14, Lines 46-68].

Regarding claim 8, Swank further teaches the method of claim 3, wherein the text comprises a plurality of characters in the line of video text data [see Figs. 2 & 7 and Abstract].

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claim 9, Swank and Schauser do not teach the method of claim 1, wherein the predetermined time interval is a timer interrupt for the remote computer in the computer network. However, it would have been obvious to one of skilled in the art at time of the invention to include a timer into the system of Swank in order to monitor and quickly identify the data which have been modified or updated on a reasonably periodic basis.

Regarding claim 10, Swank further teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the shared memory comprises a send buffer and a receive buffer [see Figs. 2 & 7 and Table 2].

Regarding claim 11, Swank further teaches the method of claim 10, further comprising during the predetermined time interval, checking the receive buffer in the first computer for keyboard data from the second computer, and if the receive buffer contains the keyboard data, then storing the keyboard data in the first computer [see Abstract and Col. 2, Lines 1-14 and Col. 14, Lines 46-68].

Claim 12 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 1.

Claims 13-16 rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claims 2-5.

Claim 17 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 9.

Serial Number: 10/717,289

Art Unit: 2155 Paper Dated 20070118

Page 7

Regarding claim 18, Swank does not explicitly teach the computer system of claim 12, wherein the memory is a random access memory. However, Schauser discloses memory is a random access memory (RAM). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Schauser into the system of Swank in order to allow randomly access to stored data without touching the preceding bytes.

Regarding claims 19-20, Swank and Schauser do not explicitly teach the computer system of claim 12, wherein the executable program code comprises a basic input/output system and wherein the executable program code is stored in an extended BIOS data area in the memory. However, it would have been obvious to one of skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to include BIOS in the system of Swank in order to enhance the system with stored data which can be updated if necessary.

Claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 10.

Claim 22 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 11.

Claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 1.

Claim 24 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 2.

Art Unit: 2155 Paper Dated 20070118

Other References Cited

- 4. The following references cited by the examiner but not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - A) Owen et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,968,349.
 - B) Agnohotri et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,608,930.
 - C) Burrell, U.S. Pat. No. 6,978,315.
 - D) Mulchandani et al, U.S. Pat. No. 5,680,542.
 - E) Knox et al, U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US 2004/0181561 A1.
 - F) Rinkevich et al, U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US 2004/0078395 A1.
- 5. A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. FAILURE TO RESPOND WITHIN THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE WILL CAUSE THE APPLICATION TO BECOME ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). EXTENSIONS OF TIME MAY BE OBTAINED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF 37 CAR 1.136(A).
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3991. The Group fax phone number is (571) 273-8300. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar, can be reached on (571) 272-4006.

Art Unit: 2155 Paper Dated 20070118

7. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Philip B. Tran
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2155
January 19, 2007